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**TRICKS**



## 1AC

### Interpretations

**First,** the resolutional “ought” is an epistemic ought, as it posits that the antecedent exists, and based on that evidence, asks us to evaluate the ought statement. As such, the resolution should be viewed based on whether it is probable that the statement is true.

Wedgewood, [Wedgwood, Ralph. "The meaning of ‘ought’." *Oxford studies in metaethics* 1 (2006): 127-160.]

The difference between the “information-relative” and “objective” uses of ‘ought’ does not consist in the kind of deliberation in which they have their essential conceptual role, but rather in the precise role that these uses of ‘ought’ play in those kinds of deliberation. I shall illustrate the difference with respect to the practical ‘ought’; a similar difference will apply to the other kinds of deliberation as well. A belief involving the objective practical ‘ought’, of the form ‘O<me, t>(p)’, unconditionally commits the believer to incorporating the proposition p into his plans; the only way in which the believer can escape this commitment is by giving up this belief. The information-relative ‘ought’, on the other hand, is relativized, at least implicitly, to a particular body of information; and the essential conceptual role of the information-relative practical ‘ought’ consists in the fact that the canonical rational ground or basis for beliefs involving this sort of ‘ought’, of the form ‘In relation to information I, O<me, t>(p)’, is the fact that being in information state I commits the believer to incorporating p into his plans about what to do at t. The epistemic **‘ought’** (as in ‘Tonight’s performance ought to be a lot of fun’) seems to be a sort of **[is]** information-relative ‘ought’, implicitly **relative to a certain body of** information that counts in the context as **evidence. The relevant** sort of **deliberation** here is not practical reasoning, but deliberation **about what to believe**; this sort of deliberation **starts out from** the information that counts as **evidence in** the **context**, **and concludes with** the thinker’s **forming at least a tentative belief in** one of **the proposition**s that are compatible with that evidence. So **the** essential conceptual role of the **epistemic ‘ought’ is** that the canonical rational ground or basis for beliefs involving this sort of ‘ought’, **of the form** ‘In relation to evidence E, **it ought to be that p’,** is the fact that evidence **[if] E commits one to forming at least a tentative belief in p.**  If this account of the essential conceptual role of the information-relative ‘ought’ is correct, it may be plausible to say that its semantic value will just be that relation between a body of information and a proposition that makes it the case that that information really does commit the relevant agent to making the relevant sort of assessment of that proposition. Thus, the semantic value of the epistemic ‘ought’ will be that relation between a body of information and a proposition that makes it the case that that information commits one to forming at least a tentative belief in that proposition. In other words, given how I am understanding the notion of ‘commitment’, this is the relation that makes it the case that if having that information is itself a rational state, then it is irrational not to form at least a tentative belief in that proposition. Presumably, **this relation has** something **to do with the proposition’s probability** on that evidence. Thus, an epistemic ‘ought’-statement, of the form ‘In relation to evidence E, it ought to be that p’ is true if and only if p is sufficiently probable given evidence E**.** In the previous section, I argued that the logic of the practical ‘ought’ reflects the consistency constraints that apply to correct planning. In a broadly similar way, the logic of each of these other kinds of ‘ought’ reflects the consistency constraints that apply to the relevant kind of assessment. (In the case of the information-relative ‘ought’, these will be consistency constraints on rational assessments of the relevant kind; in the case of the objective ‘ought’, they will be consistency constraints on correct assessments of the relevant kind.) According to the suggestions that I have made here, the relevant kind of assessment (at least in the case of the kinds of ‘ought’ that I have considered here) involves incorporating the proposition in question into some sort of (conditional) plans — or, in the case of the epistemic ‘ought’, into one’s system of beliefs. It seems plausible to me that essentially the same consistency constraints apply to conditional plans and to belief systems as to unconditional plans. First, for a conditional plan to be correct, the conditional plan must be logically consistent; and likewise, for a system of beliefs to be correct, the contents of the system must be logically consistent. Secondly, for a conditional plan or a system of beliefs to be correct, it must be possible to extend it into a maximally detailed plan or system of beliefs which is also itself correct. Finally, **it will always be correct to incorporate a logical truth to any plan or system of beliefs, and never correct to incorporate the negation of a logical truth.** Just like the practical ‘ought’, then, these other kinds of ‘ought’ are subject to all the consistency constraints of standard deontic logic. It may also be plausible that there are similar consistency constraints on rational conditional plans and on rational beliefs. If so, then it is plausible that the informative-relative ‘ought’ is also subject to the consistency constraints of deontic logic. We can capture these logical features of these sorts of ‘ought’ by means of a generalized version of the possible-worlds semantics that I sketched in the previous section for the practical ‘ought’. As we have seen, the context must determine two parameters for each occurrence of ‘ought’. First, the context must determine the conceptual role of the concept that this occurrence of ‘ought’ expresses. Determining this will involve settling the following two issues: (i) whether it is the sort of conceptual role that is characteristic of the objective ‘ought’, or the sort that is characteristic of the information-relative ‘ought’; and (ii) what kind of deliberation figures in this conceptual role — that is, what kind of assessment of propositions is the output of this sort of deliberation (for example, this output might be incorporating the proposition into one’s plans, or into one’s contingency plans, or into one’s system of beliefs). Secondly, the context must determine “the relevant domain of propositions” and the relevant background information; this information can be represented by means of a set of propositions S, which is “held fixed” in the context, so that only those propositions that are consistent with S count as “the relevant domain of propositions” in the context. (For the objective ‘ought’, the set of propositions that is “held fixed” will typically be some set of truths that need not be known or believed by any of the participants to the relevant conversation, such as all the truths that are causally independent of what the relevant agent thinks or does at the relevant time. For the information-relative ‘ought’, the set of propositions that is “held fixed” will typically be some set of propositions that are known or believed by the participants in the conversation.) So, in a context in which a set of propositions S is being “held fixed”, and ‘ought’ expresses a concept with essential conceptual role C, ‘It ought to be the case that p’ is true at a world w if, and only if, p is true in all possible worlds that (i) are compatible with all members of S and (ii) belong to the “favoured” subset of those worlds (from the standpoint of w) according to the relevant selection function that is associated with C.[26] As before, this account of the semantics leads to standard deontic logic so long as the “favoured” subset of the worlds that are compatible with S is never empty. My account of the objective practical ‘ought’ can be seen as an instance of this general pattern. According to my account, a statement involving the practical ‘ought’, of the form ‘O<A, t>(p)’, is true if and only if p is true in all worlds that (i) are compatible with all the propositions that are true in w, and causally independent of what A thinks or does at t, and (ii) belong to the “favoured” subset of those worlds, when assessed in the appropriate way with respect to how A acts at t in those worlds. Similar accounts can be given of the other kinds of ‘ought’, including the epistemic ‘ought’ (as in ‘Tonight’s performance ought to be a lot of fun’). **A statement involving the epistemic ‘ought’**, of the form ‘It ought to be the case that p’, is true at a world w if, and only if, p is true in all worlds that (i) are compatible with what counts as evidence in the context, and (ii) **belong to the “favoured” subset** of those worlds when evaluated with respect to probability on the evidence from the standpoint of w. Often, the set of propositions S that is “held fixed”, **and** so **determines which domain of propositions** (or possible worlds) **is relevant** to an ‘ought’-statement, is just determined implicitly by the context. In some cases, however, it may be indicated more explicitly. To take an example involving the practical ‘ought’, one may say: ‘If you are going to keep on taking heroin intravenously, you at least ought to use clean needles’. Here the proposition ‘You are going to keep on taking heroin intravenously’ is explicitly added to the set of propositions S that is “held fixed”, producing a set that is different from the set that would ordinarily be “held fixed” for this sort of ‘ought’. In effect, this is a conditional ‘ought’ of the sort that was analysed by David Lewis (1974b) among others. Thus, this statement is true just in case all members of the “favoured subset” of the worlds in which the addressee keeps on taking heroin intravenously (and in which all the other truths that are causally independent of what the addressee does or thinks at the relevant time also continue to hold) are also worlds in which he uses clean needles. So far as I can see, there is a conditional ‘ought’ of this sort corresponding to every one of the various kinds of ‘ought’ that I have discussed above.SK

The negative has to prove adolescent medical choice ought not be instituted, as the domain is asking whether it should; proving it is not required/skepticism/aprioris do not negate. Also, the sufficient aff burden is to prove a tentative belief in the resolution, which is fulfilled by the slightest probability of it being true.

**Next,** to prove a statement false means all possibilities of the statement must be proven false – absent reasons to vote negative, you affirm, because the statement becomes *contextually apriori*.

Ebbs, [Ebbs, Gary. "Putnam and the Contextually A Priori."]

When is it reasonable for us to accept a statement without evidence and hold it immune from disconfirmation? This question lies at the heart of Hilary Putnam's philosophy. He emphasizes that **our beliefs and theories sometimes prevent us from being able to specify how a statement may actually be false, in a sense of “specify” that goes beyond merely negating the statement.** (To save words, from here on I will assume that **tospecify how a statement may actually be false, one must do more than just negate it**.) In the 18th century, for instance, scientists did not have the theoretical understanding necessary to specify how the statement that physical space is Euclidean could be false. Today, however, after Lobachevsky and Riemann discovered non-Euclidean geometries, and Einstein developed his general theory of relativity, scientists believe that physical space is non-Euclidean, and they can specify in rich detail why the statement that physical space is Euclidean is false. This shows that **our current inability to specify how a statement may actually be false does not guarantee that we will never be able to do so.** Nevertheless, **when we cannot specify how a statement may actually be false it** has a special methodological status for us, according to Putnam—it **is *contextually a priori***. **In these circumstances,** he suggests, **it is *epistemically* *reasonable* for us to accept the statement without evidence and hold it immune from disconfirmation**.SK.

Three impacts. (a) You presume aff because the burden of proof shifts to the negative – this is an answer to the burden of proof fallacy (b) the neg has to prove every instance of the AC being false and (c) there is always a risk of affirming being true because even if we think its false now it can be true in the future.

**Further,** permissibility does not flow neg, it just proves agnosticity on the truth of the resolution. Also, statements can be believed *by the judge* to be true even if there are reasons why they are false – just because someone believes the converse of the resolution does not mean that they reject the resolution.

Olin, [Olin, Doris. "Paradox." *Google Books*. Google, Inc., 2003. Web. 24 Dec. 2014.]

**To accept a statement is to believe it**. But what is it to reject a statement? The classical view is that to reject A is to disbelieve A, and to disbelieve A is to believe ~ [not] A. Priest, however, cannot subscribe to this identification. According to him, **contradictions can be true and [statements] can be believed**. Thus we can believe A and also believe ~A. So if dialetheism adopted the classical view, it would be possible both to accept and reject a statement. But Priest insists that **acceptance and rejection are exclusive,** that **one cannot both accept and reject** A. His reason for maintaining this exclusivity is that there are dispositions to certain behaviour patterns associated with accepting and rejecting a statement, and these dispositions, he ..I-Z \_ . . . \_ \_ .. L. .......Â£L........I ..Z.....I ....... ..I.. Priest's positive thesis concerning rejection is as follows. **To reject A is not just to fail to believe it, nor to believe ~A, but to refuse to accept A.'** No gloss is given of **"refuse to acceptA**", but it is clear that the phrase is intended to convey something more than just not accepting A. One possible reading is that to refuse to accept A is to first consider A seriously, take it as a "live option", and then decline to accept it. This, however, is hardly a satisfactory interpre- tation. l may seriously consider whether Bernard loves Sara, and then decline to believe it; but this is quite compatible with my being agnostic on the issue of whether Bernard loves Sara. Certainly, it does not follow from the above that I reject the claim that he loves her. So this is not, for Priest, an acceptable reading of "refuse to accept". Another possible interpretation of Priest is that to refuse to acceptA is to not believeA and to be committed to not believing A; that is, to believe that no further evidence will be forthcoming that will (or should) get you to believe A. The difficulty here again is that I may, in this sense, refuse to accept that there is life on other plan- ets, and yet be agnostic on this issue. For l may be agnostic on this matter while believing that we will never have adequate evidence for or against the existence of extraterrestrial life. Let us give up the attempt to clarify Priest's account of rejecting a statement in terms of refusing to accept for the moment, and brieï¬‚y consider other options. An alternative suggestion is that to reject A is to believe ~A and not also believe A. This, one might think, will get around the difficulties of the classical view. But even this somewhat desperate manoeuvre does not succeed as an 28 PARADOX account of rejection in a dialetheist system. **If I now believe ~A, and do not believe A, this may be because I am agnostic on the issue of A's truth, because I regard A's truth as an open issue.** But if this is so, **we surely cannot say that I reject A**. The most promising proposal may be that **to reject A is to believe that A is untrue,** that is, **[which means] to believe that A is false only.** A difficulty with this proposal will emerge in the final section of this chapter. For now, it suffices to say that one outstanding issue for dialetheism is whether the theory can make sense of what it is to reject a state- I'TIPTII'.SK

Thus, a propositions truth can be determined to be false only if the proposition is absolutely false.

I adopt a margin of error for all of the statements in the affirmative case.

### FW

**I value government obligations**. Only rules can determine such obligations, as all actions are taken within context of rules, which are normative in nature. All rules and norms a government makes are in context to an outer rule which governs governments themselves. Only this solves the infinite regress and avoids skepticism, as without a rule to govern all rules, we would not have any normative rule to guide action.

Schapiro, [Schapiro, Tamar (Stanford University). Three Conceptions of Action in Moral Theory, Noûs 35 (1):93–117, 2001.]

In his early article, “Two Concepts of Rules,” Rawls sets out to limit the scope of the utilitarian principle by arguing that it is inapplicable to actions of a certain type. 25 His claim is that actions which fall under practice rules, for example actions governed by the rules of games and social institutions, have a structure which is different from the structure of action presupposed by utilitarianism. Such actions are not, therefore, directly subject to utilitarian evaluation. **Whereas a practice as a whole can be judged in terms of** its overall **consequences**, Rawls claims, **a** particular **move within a practice can only be judged in relation to** the practice **rules**. Rawls’ argument turns on a conceptual point about the relation between the rules of a practice and the cases to which they are applied. **Practice rules**, he claims, **[which]** **are “logically prior”** to particular cases [because].  [“]**In a practice there are rules** setting up offices, **specifying certain forms of action appropriate to various offices**, establishing penalties for the breach of rules, and so on. We may think of the rules of a practice as defining offices, moves, and offenses. Now what is meant by saying that the practice is logically prior to particular cases is this: **given any rule which specifies a form of action (a move), a particular action which would be taken as falling under this rule given that there is the practice would not be described as that sort of action unless there was the practice.**[”] Rawls illustrates the logical priority of practice rules over actions with reference to moves [I]n the game of American baseball. 27 **[For example,] [o]utside the** “stage-setting” of **the game [of baseball], it is** certainly possible to “throw a ball, run, or swing a peculiarly shaped piece of wood.” But it is **impossible to “steal [a] base, or strike out**, or draw a walk, or make an error, or balk.” 28 **Where the rules of baseball are in force, movements come to constitute moves** of particular kinds, **and** conversely **in the absence of such rules, actions** which might appear to be moves **are** properly described as **mere movements. In this respect**, Rawls claims, practice rules differ from another general class of rules called “summary rules.” Summary rules [which] are “rules of thumb.” Their role is to allow us to approximate the results of applying some more precise but perhaps more unwieldy principle to particular cases [and therefore] . As such, summary rules are arrived at by generalizing the results of the prior procedure. They are “reports” of these results, presented as guides for deliberating about what to do in cases which are relevantly similar to those used to generate the reports. Summary rules are therefore logically posterior to the cases to which they apply. [f]or in order to specify a summary rule, it is necessary to generalize over some range of cases, and the relevant descriptions of these cases must be given in advance if generalization over them is to be possible. Whereas summary rules presuppose the existence of a well-defined context of application, the establishment of **a practice imposes a** new conceptual and **normative structure on the context to which they are to apply**. In this sense, a practice amounts to “the specification of a new form of activity,” along with a new order of status relations in which that activity makes sense. 29 From the point of view of a participant, the establishment of a practice transforms an expanse of grass into “playing field,” bags on the ground into “bases,” and individuals into occupants of determinate “positions.” Universal laws come to hold a priori, for example that “three strikes make an out,” and that “every inning has a top and a bottom.” And within that new order people come to have special powers, such as the power to “strike out,” or to “steal a base.”  The salient point for Rawls’ purposes is that **there are constitutive constraints on the exercise of** these new **powers**, constraints **by which any participant must abide** **in order to make** her **movements count as** the **moves** she intends them to be. [Schapiro, Tamar (Stanford University).  Three Conceptions of Action in Moral Theory, Noûs 35 (1):93–117, 2001.]

**And**, if the negative debater responds to the affirmative framework, they must line by line the AC and not run generic dumps as this is key to philosophical education – just running generic dumps means that they are not learning from the framework debate, and neither am I, as the arguments do not truly interact.

Actions must be done in the context of international law since the rules of international law are the practice rules that define what it means to be a government in the international arena, even if states have different domestic ends.

Nardin explains, [Terry Nardin , “International Ethics and International Law”. Review of International Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Jan., 1992), pp. 19-30, published by Cambridge University Press . JStor, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20097279.]

**Any description of the international system as** an association of **states that share** certain **ends** **is** necessarily **incomplete**. Such an association would not constitute a rule-governed moral or legal order. **What transforms** a number of **powers**, contingently **related in terms of shared interests, into a society** proper **is** not their agreement to participate in a common enterprise for as long as they desire to participate, but **their participation in** and implicit **recognition of the practices**, procedures, **and other rules of international law that compose international society**. **The rules of international law**, in other words, **are** not merely regulatory but **constitutive**: they not only create a normative order among separate political communities but define the status, rights, and duties of these communities within this normative order. In international society **'states' are constituted** as such **within the practice of** international **law; 'statehood' is** a position or role that is **defined by** international **law, not independent of** **it.** International law includes rules that are the outcome of cooperation to further shared goals as well as rules that make such cooperation possible and that exist even where shared goals are lacking. But it is rules of the latter sort that are fundamental.

Thus, the only acceptable standard in the context of the resolution is **consistency with international law**; I reserve the right to clarify in CX or otherwise. This is the best standard for additional reasons.

**First**, abstract conceptions of the good are infinitely regressive since we can always question the assumptions behind why that good is considered to be a good. Any attempt to justify such a good ultimately ends up terminating in assertions due to the finality of human logic. Grounding morality in rules is the only way to avoid skepticism because it spells out the exact permissible, prohibited and obligatory parts of a rule and removes any abstractness the rule could have. If contracts don’t accomplish then purpose, then no moral rules would apply to agents at all and no moral prohibitions would exist.

**Second,** We should utilize the aff role of the ballot of consistency with iLaw as the one for the round if it is fair and educational as this preserves most of the 1AC because I'm forced to speak first and define a starting point for debate, so not using this as the framework gets rid of all AC offense.

**Third**, it is impossible to see from a viewpoint outside of our own; even if an objective truth existed it would be tainted by our subjectivity because we can never experience the world from a viewpoint of another. Any judgment is bound to be so because we would have to know ourselves to be able to access our relationship with others; however we lack a static understanding of ourselves to do so. This implies that only omni-perspectivism can avoid skepticism and create a cogent epistemology.

Fincke explains, [Daniel Fincke, “Truth Requires Telling More Stories From More Perspectives”, 2012.]

This is very Nietzschean advice. Nietzsche’s perspectivism is the idea that **[S]ince we cannot ever see things from outside of [our] perspectives**, we must *multiply*them rather than convince ourselves that we can ever be detached. Rather than attempting to see things from an impossible “view from nowhere”, **we must attempt to see** things **from as many [perspectives]** “somewheres” **as possible**. This is often confused for relativism. “Everyone has their own perspective so there is no true one, so everyone is right.” But that’s not what Nietzsche is saying. What he is saying is that **there are facets of a subject, which can only be** grasped and **understood from** within **different** **relationships to it. The table looks different standing across from it than** how **it looks from underneath**. **To** really **understand** the table **is to investigate** it **from numerous angles** **and** then to constantly be able to **incorporate** into one’s thinking the **important details learned from each angle**. Nietzsche thinks that part of the epistemic challenge of [is] getting the truth is to *feel* differently towards subjects because in different feeling states different important aspects of the things will come to light.

Epistemology comes prior to other ethical constructs, as we need a cogent knowledge in order to be able to discern between right and wrong. We need to know how we what we know before we pick the best definition. Prefer this form of epistemology because we are extremely uncertain of our knowledge; experts have debated for centuries and have still not come up with a singular definition. Only international law, which includes all perspectives, can serve as the best foundation for our knowledge, which means it is a prescriptive reason to prefer international law. **And,** if the negative runs an opposing framework, they must provide a counter-epistemology text in order for it to be functional, as all knowledge comes from epistemologies and its key to education as having a clear text is the only way that I can know under which theory of knowledge their arguments function. Otherwise, they concede the affirmative epistemology and the affirmative standard.

**Fourth**, international law sets a norm as a right-duty or an obligation that ought to be fulfilled, and as such, prescribes action onto individuals.

Quirico, [Ottavio, “A Formal Prescriptive Approach to General Principles of (International) Law”, European University Institute, 2007]

From the analytical viewpoint **a norm can** formally **be regarded as a right-duty** (or claim-obligation) relation (1) **that regulates behaviour (action/inaction)** (2) **among subjects** (3) **in definite space** (4) **and time** (5). In normative terms, general principles **(the ‘basis’) of (international) law can be conceived of as general obligations, i.e. obligations** erga omnes (**towards everyone**). **Obligations** erga omnes, indivisible or divisible because of their content, **link a subject to every other subject of international law, endowed with a correlative claim, so that the whole obligations** erga omnes **are matched by the whole claims** erga omnes **of all the subjects of international law.** Indivisible obligations erga omnes are unavailable from the viewpoint of the power, so cogentes, **breaches violate** necessarily all the correlative **claims**, possibly **enabling every subject to invoke the responsibility** and impose sanctions. Correspondingly, sanctions should be regarded as indivisible obligations erga omnes, the violation of which allows universal enforcement. Nevertheless, specifically by reason of the gravity of the breach, it is possible to split primary and secondary norms, conceiving of the sanction as a bilateral relation allowing solely reciprocal enforcement in the case of an infringement. Divisible obligations erga omnes are available from the viewpoint of the power, so dispositivae, **breaches must be seen as relative, enabling only the subject(s) injured to invoke the responsibility** and impose sanctions. Correspondingly, sanctions should be regarded as bilateral obligations, the infringement of which gives rise to reciprocal enforcement. Nevertheless, it is possible to figure out that specifically the gravity of the breach ‘unifies’ the primary divisible obligation, allowing universal invocation of the responsibility, so that the secondary obligation could be either bilateral or a general indivisible one, respectively permitting relative or absolute enforcement in the case of a breach.SK

Thus, every subject is linked under international law, and a breach of international law breaks the obligation to everyone that is under the international law.

**Fifth,** Empirics prove the existence of a collective unconscious.

Smith,

“**Jung**sought to **prove[d] the existence of**archetypes and **the collective unconscious**by three main methods. First, he used the Word Association Test to demonstrate[d] extensively that various complexes had been constellated in the psyches of certain individuals. For example, a mother complex has at its core the ‘mother’ archetype. Numerous images or memories of personal experiences related to mother are held together by charged affects or feeling-tones, usually negative, because the individual’s complex is based on some psychic or emotional trauma (Jung 3). Second, he documented the presence of archetypal symbols in unconscious mental activity manifested in the delusions, hallucinations, and dreams of those who had not been exposed to such symbols by either education or travel. A classic example that is frequently cited is the 1906 case of a male paranoid schizophrenic (Jung 6, par. 105). In this instance, the patient invited Jung to engage in a sort of ritual with him, which involved ‘worshipping’ of the sun. The patient also purported to see a short tube hanging down from the sun, and said ‘that is where the wind comes from’ (Ibid.) Four years later Jung came across a book written by Albrecht Dieterich describing a rare Mithraic text from the Alexandrian school of mysticism. This book contained a similar ritual as well as the description of a tube that extended from the sun that was ‘the origin of the wind’. Jung knew that the patient had no conscious awareness of this archaic body of knowledge (Ibid.). Third, Jung cited **[through] the similarities and symbols in disparate cultures**that had**developed without contact with each other. For example, the serpent**or snake **is**such **an ancient and widely known symbol.**As Jung stated, **‘The idea of transformation and renewal by means of the serpent is a well-substantiated archetype.**It is [a] healing [symbol]’ (jung 7, par. 184). Henderson further identified serpents as a transcendent symbol of the depths, ‘symbolic denizens of the collective unconscious’ (Henderson 2, p. 154).”

Two implications **a.**Ilaw is the best theory to overcome the blobject problem as it unites all people under a universal rule they’ve agreed to and **b.**Monism proves that concepts can’t conflict because conflict assumes the two things in question are separate entities. However, monism proves that everything coexists in the blobject.

**Further,** Neg must only gain offense from one piece of unconditional offense on a single layer, as otherwise it would be skewing my time in the round, as they can just spread out the aff in the 1N, which is structurally unfair. This is also is independently key to education as there is no educational benefit to running multiple conditional arguments and then dropping them in the next speech.

Impacts can only be judged with relation to indexes under which those actions are taken – if the negative proves that living wages are wrong under some other index that is not international law, that still does not negate as it does not disprove the affirmative that employers ought to be required to provide them under the index of international law – proving this one locus of duty is sufficient to affirm.

Rödl, [Rödl, Sebastian. *Self-Consciousness*, Harvard University Press, 2007. pg. 71. ]

This view is untenable for reasons analogous to those we mounted against the corresponding account of instrumental reasoning. Suppose the normative order of the question what to believe, on an occasion of its being asked, is a set of propositions ∑. In order to indicate this, we give the imperative an index specifying that set; we write, not “It is right to believe *p* because ∑” but “It is right∑ [right given a particular index] to believe *p*”. Now, nothing we said about [the set] ∑ excludes that it may be right∑ [right given the set] to believe p and [right given the set] right∑ to believe non p. **Thinking it is right[under the set]**∑ **to believe *p* peacefully coexists with thinking it is right∑ to believe *non p*.** This shows that, thinking it is right∑ to believe *p*, I have not determined what to believe. For, thinking this is not having affixed myself to p in a manner that excludes affixing myself in the same way to non p. **But thinking it right to believe *p*—thinking is true—is so affixing myself to *p****.*

And, look to aims first – ontologically, actions are defined by their aims, not their implementation.

Tappan, [Tappan, Henry Philip. *A Treatise on the Will*. Glasgow: Lang, Adamson, 1857. ]

**In order to do, there must be something for it to do, and something in respect of which to do**. **The reason** in its **laws supplies one class of aims** and objects of ac- tion. The reason supplies us with something to do when it commands us to practice benevolence and justice. So likewise **the sensitivity supplies the will with aims of action-supplies it with something to do**, in the emotions and desires, **which are to be awakened and gratified**. The passions are thus **active principles of our being**. I mean by this that the pleasurable excitements of passion form motives in view of which **the will determines itself.** Thus the love of knowledge, the passion for fame, the love of kindred, the animal appetites, &c., are. SK

Thus, iLaw is a constitutive feature of action, providing the guideline in respect of which actions are formed.

Because we live in a multiverse, everything is true somewhere, including this resolution.

O’Leary, [O'Leary, Denyse. "Colliding Universes." *Multiverse Theory: Replacing the Big Fix with the Sure Thing?* N.p., 3 June 2008. Web. 26 Dec. 2014. <http://collidinguniverses.blogspot.ca/2008/06/multiverse-theory-replacing-big-fix.html>.]

Beyond question? Perhaps, but not beyond imagination. What if **there are many** flopped **universes**? Or, whether there are or not, people are prepared to believe that they exist. **That may be true today**, irrespective of evidence, mathematician David Berlinski suggests. In [The Devil’s Delusion:](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0307396266/104-3908503-3632740?ie=UTF8&tag=accessresearc-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0307396266) Atheism and Its Scientific Pretensions, Berlinski implies that one reason for the attraction of **[because of] multiverse or many universes theory,** sometimes called the "Landscape", as in his comments below, is that it suits a local, modern mindset so perfectly: The idea that **everything is really true somewhere** "has been current in every college classroom for at least fifty years. It arises spontaneously in discussion, like soap bubbles in water." (P. 123) He goes on to say, The Landscape ... is all-purpose in its intent. **It works no matter the theory.** And it works by means of the simple principle that **by multiplying universes, the Landscape dissolves improbabilities.** To the question What are***the odds***? the landscape provides the invigorating answer that it **hardly matter**s. **If the fine-structure constant has in our universe one value, in some other universe it has another value. Given sufficiently many universes, things improbable in one must from the perspective of them all appear certain**. The same reasoning applies to questions about the laws of nature. Why is Newton's universal law of gravitation true? No need to ask. In another universe, it is not. The Big Fix has by this maneuver been supplanted by the Sure Thing. (p. 124) SK

Thus, the resolution is true in at least one instance.

### Contention (0:18)

#### International law mandates that adolescents have the right to make autonomous medical choices.

Ruggeri et. al. ’14, [“Braving Difficult Choices Alone: Children’s and Adolescents’ Medical Decision Making” Azzurra Ruggeri, Michaela Gummerum2 , Yaniv Hanoch2 Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, England. SK]

As part of an attempt to increase children’s participation in decision making, **Articles 12 and 13 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child specify that minors have the right to express themselves freely, be heard on all matters affecting them, and have their views taken seriously** [1]. In recent years, **there has been a shift from a paternalistic medical model**, **where physicians and parents hold an authoritative role in determining a child’s treatment, to one advocating minors’ involvement in their medical treatment** [2]. Simultaneously, the US Supreme Court has come to recognize that minors who show maturity and competence deserve a voice in determining their medical treatment and even allows minors, in cases such as abortion, treatments for substance abuse and sexually transmitted diseases, and contraception, to receive treatment without parental consent or notification [3]. **According to the Article 6 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine**: Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, ratified in Italy in 2001, ‘‘**the opinion of the minor shall be taken into consideration as an increasingly determining factor in proportion to his or her age and degree of maturity**.’’ Yet, a number of important questions remain open. Do children and adolescents welcome this change, wishing to be actively involved and taking responsibility for medical decisions regardless of the severity of the decision? Can they anticipate their emotional reactions to these choices? SK

### Underview

**(1)** Aff gets RVIs and presumption ground because of rebuttal and double extension time skew and because most people flip neg, which outweighs epistemological neg presumption arguments because time determines the structure of debate. Skep triggers presumption because we evaluate with no offense.

**(2)** C/X checks on theory to avoid useless theory and any theory run on one of these spikes is a counter-interp, as each spike is itself an interp.

**(3)** Aff doesnt have to spec anything because grammatically the resolution does not ask me to specify – grammar is key because it is how we comprehend fairness and education

**(4)** Reject neg arguments that derive violations/links from the resolution –skews my strat as I have to defend the resolution. This means reasonability on T because multiple terms and definitions skews predictability, which is the brightline.

**(5)** Neg must defend converse and aff actor meaning no CPs to solve back infinity to 1 burden skew.

Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity and education is a voter because it is the long term function of debate. Drop the argument on aff and neg interps because of reciprocal punishment

## Extensions

### Wedgewood Extension

#### “Possible” Extension

Extend **Wedgewood** who explains that the epistemic ought is an ought statement that describes a state of affairs and proposition, and then asks us to evaluate if it is true given some subset. Extend that this is true of this resolution, as it proposes that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ exists and then asks us to evaluate if it ought to be a certain form of right. Extend that the epistemic ought definitionally entails that we evaluate it based on whether or not it is possible that the statement is true. Extend that as it is always possible that the AC is true, you affirm.

#### “Impossible” Extension

Extend **Wedgewood** who explains that the epistemic ought is an ought statement that describes a state of affairs and proposition, and then asks us to evaluate if it is true given some subset. Extend that this is true of this resolution, as it proposes that the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ exists and then asks us to evaluate if it ought to be \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Extend that this epistemic ought definitionally entails that the aff has to prove that there is a possibility of the statement being true, and as such, the negative burden *to win* is to prove that there is 0% chance of the resolution being true. As the neg is not meeting their burden, you affirm.

# EXTRA TRICKS CARDS

Disproving instances of a statement does not disprove the statement as a whole – to accept a statement is to allow for adjustment of what we have accepted as truth in order to change those notions of truth

Moore,

course of sense experience. For Quine that makes no sense. **Any statement we accept,** even the statement that aunts are female, **is just part of our overall account of how things are, and, had our sense experience taken a different course, it would have been a candidate for rejection.** Imagine **for instance**, that **[if]** **we had discovered some tribe in which** **we had observed,** among the siblings of parents, **a very high correlation**, but not an exceptionless one, **between being female and playing some crucial social role.** **And imagine** that **we had found it more convenient**, when talking about members of this tribe, **to align aunthood with playing this role than with being female**, Then, **in acceding to this, we would have acknowledged a few male aunts'.** (It is natural to protest that we would at most have found it convenient to call a few people 'male aunts', but that this would have involved a change in the meaning of the word 'aunt'. Indeed, in later writings, Quine himself talks in such terms." In 'Two Dogmas', however, his position is less compromising, and the idea that **each expression has its own monadic meaning** which it might retain or lose through any change of doctrine is itself part of what is under attack.) Likewise**, a synthetically true statement is a statement that, although it is confirmed by the actual course of sense experience, would have been confuted by some other possible course of sense experience**. But that too makes no sense for Quine. **Any statement we accept we could still have accepted, no matter what course our sense experience had taken, if we had made suitable compensatory adjustments to the rest of what we accepted**, **most obviously if we had dismissed any apparent counter evidence as illusory**."-3'

Olin,

**To accept a statement is to believe it**. But what is it to reject a statement? The classical view is that to reject A is to disbelieve A, and to disbelieve A is to believe ~ [not] A. Priest, however, cannot subscribe to this identification. According to him, **contradictions can be true and [statements] can be believed**. Thus we can believe A and also believe ~A. So if dialetheism adopted the classical view, it would be possible both to accept and reject a statement. But Priest insists that **acceptance and rejection are exclusive,** that **one cannot both accept and reject** A. His reason for maintaining this exclusivity is that there are dispositions to certain behaviour patterns associated with accepting and rejecting a statement, and these dispositions, he ..I-Z \_ . . . \_ \_ .. L. .......Â£L........I ..Z.....I ....... ..I.. Priest's positive thesis concerning rejection is as follows. **To reject A is not just to fail to believe it, nor to believe ~A, but to refuse to accept A.'** No gloss is given of **"refuse to acceptA**", but it is clear that the phrase is intended to convey something more than just not accepting A. One possible reading is that to refuse to accept A is to first consider A seriously, take it as a "live option", and then decline to accept it. This, however, is hardly a satisfactory interpre- tation. l may seriously consider whether Bernard loves Sara, and then decline to believe it; but this is quite compatible with my being agnostic on the issue of whether Bernard loves Sara. Certainly, it does not follow from the above that I reject the claim that he loves her. So this is not, for Priest, an acceptable reading of "refuse to accept". Another possible interpretation of Priest is that to refuse to acceptA is to not believeA and to be committed to not believing A; that is, to believe that no further evidence will be forthcoming that will (or should) get you to believe A. The difficulty here again is that I may, in this sense, refuse to accept that there is life on other plan- ets, and yet be agnostic on this issue. For l may be agnostic on this matter while believing that we will never have adequate evidence for or against the existence of extraterrestrial life. Let us give up the attempt to clarify Priest's account of rejecting a statement in terms of refusing to accept for the moment, and brieï¬‚y consider other options. An alternative suggestion is that to reject A is to believe ~A and not also believe A. This, one might think, will get around the difficulties of the classical view. But even this somewhat desperate manoeuvre does not succeed as an 28 PARADOX account of rejection in a dialetheist system. **If I now believe ~A, and do not believe A, this may be because I am agnostic on the issue of A's truth, because I regard A's truth as an open issue.** But if this is so, **we surely cannot say that I reject A**. The most promising proposal may be that **to rejectA is to believe that A is untrue,** that is, **[which means] to believe that A is false only.** A difficulty with this proposal will emerge in the final section of this chapter. For now, it suffices to say that one outstanding issue for dialetheism is whether the theory can make sense of what it is to reject a state- I'TIPTII'.s

To prove a statement false means all possibilities of the statement must be proven false – absent reasons to vote negative, you affirm, because the statement becomes *contextually apriori*.

Ebbs,

When is it reasonable for us to accept a statement without evidence and hold it immune from disconfirmation? This question lies at the heart of Hilary Putnam's philosophy. He emphasizes that **our beliefs and theories sometimes prevent us from being able to specify how a statement may actually be false, in a sense of “specify” that goes beyond merely negating the statement.** (To save words, from here on I will assume that **tospecify how a statement may actually be false, one must do more than just negate it**.) In the 18th century, for instance, scientists did not have the theoretical understanding necessary to specify how the statement that physical space is Euclidean could be false. Today, however, after Lobachevsky and Riemann discovered non-Euclidean geometries, and Einstein developed his general theory of relativity, scientists believe that physical space is non-Euclidean, and they can specify in rich detail why the statement that physical space is Euclidean is false. This shows that **our current inability to specify how a statement may actually be false does not guarantee that we will never be able to do so.** Nevertheless, **when we cannot specify how a statement may actually be false it** has a special methodological status for us, according to Putnam—it **is *contextually a priori***. **In these circumstances,** he suggests, **it is *epistemically* *reasonable* for us to accept the statement without evidence and hold it immune from disconfirmation**.

This has two impacts. (a) you presume aff because the burden of proof shifts to the negative – this is an answer to the burden of proof fallacy and (b) the neg has to prove every instance of the AC being false.

Shaeffer,

Put briefly, Karofsky’s argument against the possibility of things being other than as they are goes as follows. **Consider the proposition ‘This desk is white’, and assume that it is true**. In order for the proposition to be contingently true, **Karofsky points out**, the following proposition ‘**This very desk could have been red’** must be true. But the latter proposition, Karofsky says, is false. It is not the case that, given that this very desk is white, it could have been red. **She says:** Because it is physically impossible for there to be an alteration in a causal series, **it is physically impossible for this desk to be any color other than white**. Now I think **this is misleading**, for the following reason. An alteration is a change to something that already exists, as when, for instance, one has a suit or a pet altered. So it is of course true that, given that a causal series already exists (a particular history has already taken place), it cannot be changed and so cannot be otherwise. So yes, one can agree that, if to say that it is physically possible for the desk to be red is to say that history could be altered so that this desk is now red, then it is not physically possible of the desk to be red. But that alone does not rule out the possibility that a different causal order might have obtained in the first place. Perhaps this objection will be seen as nitpicking about the use of the word ‘alteration’. So let’s look more closely at the main part of Karofsky’s argument, where she says: In order for it to be a genuine possibility for this very desk…to be some other color than it actually is, there must have been an alteration in the history of this desk, and an alteration in the history of the assembly line that created and painted it, and thus an alteration in the history of the universe, and thus an alteration in the physical laws that govern this universe. In other words, the desk’s being red must violate some physical law or other. Consequently, the so-called physical possibility that this very desk could be red is in fact a physical impossibility. Therefore, [the statement that this very desk could have been red] is false. I take it that the argument is as follows: In order for it to be possible for the desk to be red, the history of the world must be different than it actually is. But the history of the world could be different than it actually is only if some physical law is violated. It is physically impossible to violate physical laws. So it is impossible that that the world be different than it actually is. But what does Karofsky have in mind when she says that in order for it to be possible for the desk to be red some physical law must be violated? Consider as examples the physical law that energy can be changed from one form to another, but it cannot be created or destroyed, or that every object in uniform motion tends to remain in a state of motion unless an external force is applied to it. By themselves, they do not determine any particular outcome or event; they only do that when certain initial conditions are in place. So shouldn’t Karofsky conclude that **in order for it to be possible for the desk to be red**, **either** some **physical law must be violated or certain prior conditions** (that the desk factory was opened for instance) **would have to have been different**? Of course, Karofsky can reply that the prior conditions themselves were in place only because certain laws that cannot be violated must have obtained. But I think she can only push this reasoning back so far. For when we get to the conditions under which the physical universe itself was created in the so-called “big bang”, it is not known whether that was governed by any physical laws, or if the physical laws themselves came into being when the physical universe did. If the latter, we do not have to imagine any violation of physical law in order to imagine the primordial conditions that generated the beginning of the physical universe having been different than they were. To put it another way, one could ask: how did the fundamental physical laws themselves come to be as they are and not otherwise? Could they have been different? Here it is not open to Karofsky to claim that, in order for them to have been different, certain physical laws would have to have been violated unless she assumes that at no time in the history of the universe was there any event that was not itself determined by some physical law. But that is controversial with regard to the creation of the universe itself. So I think the appeal to physical laws to rule out the possibility that this universe could have been different than it is fails. (It is interesting to note that Spinoza, who took the fundamental laws of nature to follow deductively from the essence of the one and only one substance, does rightfully conclude that all events are determined and therefore that things could not be other than they are. But that view only works because Spinoza takes the fundamental physical laws to be themselves logically determined). Karofsky anticipates this objection, so she appeals to Gilbert Ryle, who says of an unbottled-up hoot of laughter:For it would not have been a hoot at all, and so not that hoot, had I bottled up my laughter. I could not, logically, have bottled it up. For it was an unbottled hoot of laughter. The fact that it occurred is already contained in my allusion to ‘that hoot of laughter’. So a sort of contradiction is produced when I try to say that that hoot of laughter need not have occurred. No such contradiction is produced when I say ‘I did not have to hoot with laughter’. It is the demonstrative word ‘that’…which refused to consort with ‘did not occur’ or ‘might not have occurred’. It seems to me, however, that Ryle is simply making a Wittgenstinian point about the use of the word “that”. He is saying that we use the word “that” to ‘point’ to a particular existing thing or event, (it has, as Wittgenstein would say, an ‘ostensive’ use), so “that” does not “consort with” ‘did not occur’ because had the event not occurred “that” would not refer to anything, and so would be without use. But that seems hardly to bear on whether ‘That chair could have been red’ is true. If we do take Ryle to be making a metaphysical point, the argument then seems to be that **this universe** (**or this chair**, or this hoot) **could not have been different because then it would be a different universe or chair** or hoot. Now it is true that this is not an appeal to causal determinism; it is, rather, an appeal to the philosophical intuition that a thing’s identity is the sum of its actual properties. Then it would be self-contradictory to say that this chair might have been red instead of white. But it is not obviously self-contradictory (though I suppose that depends on who you ask; Leibniz thought it was self-contradictory, and if any appeal to authority is ever valid it would be in case of appeal to Leibniz). The point is, it is at least controversial to say that a thing’s identity is the sum of its properties. I turn now to the second objection I envision. If it is not contingent that the desk is red, then it must be necessary. Now, **consider** a proposition that is paradigmatic of a necessary truth, **that the sum of the angles of this triangle is 180°.** I take it that, **given that the statement is necessary, it follows that it is not possible that tomorrow the triangle’s angles will ever add up to something other than 180°, so that the proposition ‘It is possible for the sum of the triangle’s angles to be 200° tomorrow’ is necessarily false**. But then, this is a disanalogy with the statement that the chair is white. For **it does not seem that the proposition ‘It is possible for the chair to be red tomorrow’ is false, let alone necessarily false**. So **it seems that ‘This chair is white’ is not necessary.** Therefore, **the possibility proposition that corresponds** to it **is not false**.

Nonsense Card

Brown explains.

The chief of the contradictions that have come under considera- tion, as given by Mr. Russell, are: (1) The Epimenides. (2) The class of all those classes that are not members of themselves. This class can neither be nor not be a member of itself. (3) **If T is a relation which subsists between two relations R and S, when R does not have the relation R to S, then "1R has the relation T to S" is equivalent to "R does not have the relation R to S." But if R and St have the value T, by substitution, "T has the relation T to T" is equivalent to "T has not the relation T to T."**

Statements are always false as they do not have relations between each other.

Because we live in a multiverse, everything is true somewhere, including this resolution.

O’Leary,

Beyond question? Perhaps, but not beyond imagination. What if **there are many** flopped **universes**? Or, whether there are or not, people are prepared to believe that they exist. **That may be true today**, irrespective of evidence, mathematician David Berlinski suggests. In [The Devil’s Delusion:](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0307396266/104-3908503-3632740?ie=UTF8&tag=accessresearc-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0307396266) Atheism and Its Scientific Pretensions, Berlinski implies that one reason for the attraction of **[because of] multiverse or many universes theory,** sometimes called the "Landscape", as in his comments below, is that it suits a local, modern mindset so perfectly: The idea that **everything is really true somewhere** "has been current in every college classroom for at least fifty years. It arises spontaneously in discussion, like soap bubbles in water." (P. 123) He goes on to say, The Landscape ... is all-purpose in its intent. **It works no matter the theory.** And it works by means of the simple principle that **by multiplying universes, the Landscape dissolves improbabilities.** To the question What are***the odds***? the landscape provides the invigorating answer that it **hardly matter**s. **If the fine-structure constant has in our universe one value, in some other universe it has another value. Given sufficiently many universes, things improbable in one must from the perspective of them all appear certain**. The same reasoning applies to questions about the laws of nature. Why is Newton's universal law of gravitation true? No need to ask. In another universe, it is not. The Big Fix has by this maneuver been supplanted by the Sure Thing. (p. 124)